Case 3:16-cv-00489-CWR-BWR Document 15 Filed 07/19/17 Page 1 of 52

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL NO. 3:16CV00489-WHB-JCG

THE HINDS COUNTY BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS, HINDS COUNTY
SHERIFF VICTOR MASON, IN HIS
OFFICIAL CAPACITY

DEFENDANTS

TRANSCRIPT OF IN-PERSON STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN C. GARGIULO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

JULY 10, 2017 GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI

REPORTED BY: TERI B. NORTON, RMR, FCRR, RDR

Mississippi CSR #1906

2012 15TH STREET, SUITE 403 GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI 39501 (228) 563-1748

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CHRISTOPHER N. CHENG, ESQUIRE
LAURA L. COON COWALL, ESQUIRE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE - CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION
SPECIAL LITIGATION SECTION
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

CANDACE GREGORY MAYBERRY, ESQUIRE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 501 EAST COURT STREET SUITE 4.430

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201

FOR THE DEFENDANT, HINDS COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

PIETER TEEUWISSEN, ESQUIRE ANTHONY SIMON, ESQUIRE SIMON & TEEUWISSEN, PLLC 621 EAST NORTHSIDE DRIVE JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39206

FOR THE DEFENDANT, HINDS COUNTY SHERIFF VICTOR MASON:

CLAIRE BARKER, ESQUIRE HINDS COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT POST OFFICE BOX 1452 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39215-1452

COURT MONITORS: ELIZABETH SIMPSON, DAVID PARRISH

1 THE COURT: Ms. Busby, please announce the case 2 that's on the docket. 3 THE CLERK: United States of America versus Hinds 4 County, et al, Civil Matter Number 3:16cv489. We are here on 5 an in-person status conference. 6 THE COURT: And in that matter, is the government, 7 the plaintiff, ready to go forward? Yes, Your Honor. 8 MR. CHENG: 9 Sir, if you could please, for the record, THE COURT: 10 introduce yourself and any co-counsel you have with you. 11 MR. CHENG: Yes. My name is Christopher Cheng. 12 an attorney with the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights 13 Division, Special Litigation Section. This is Laura Cowall. 14 She is one of our special counsels. We also have Candace 15 Mayberry from the U.S. Attorney's Office here in the Southern 16 District of Mississippi. 17 THE COURT: Good afternoon to you all. Ma'am, what 18 is your last name again? 19 MS. COWALL: On the record, it is currently Coon. I 20 recently changed to my married name, which is Cowall, 21 C-O-W-A-L-L. 22 THE COURT: Cowall. All right. Thank you, ma'am. 23 And is the Hinds County Sheriff's Department ready to go 24 forward? 25 MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor. Claire Barker,

1 in-house counsel for the Hinds County Sheriff's Department. 2 THE COURT: Ms. Barker, has anyone accompanied you to 3 the hearing today? 4 MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor. If you would stand, 5 please. We have Sheriff Mason. 6 **THE COURT:** How are you, sir? 7 **SHERIFF MASON:** Fine, sir. 8 MS. BARKER: Major Pete Luke. 9 **THE COURT:** Major, how are you? 10 MAJOR LUKE: Good, sir. 11 MS. BARKER: And Major Mary Rushing. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for being here. It's a 13 pleasure to meet you. And what says the Hinds County Board of 14 Supervisors? 15 MR. TEEUWISSEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Pieter 16 Teeuwissen, board attorney for Hinds County. Also here at 17 counsel table is Anthony Simon, special legal counsel for Hinds 18 County. And present in the courtroom today -- I'm going to 19 step so you can see -- Darrel McQuirter, who is president for 20 the Hinds County Board of Supervisors. 21 **THE COURT:** How are you, sir? 22 MR. TEEUWISSEN: Also, Supervisor Mike Morgan with 23 the Hinds County Board of Supervisors. 24 Supervisor, how are you? THE COURT: 25 MR. TEEUWISSEN: County Administrator Carmen Davis.

1 **THE COURT:** How are you, ma'am? 2 MR. TEEUWISSEN: And then sitting on the other side 3 of the courtroom, we also have the compliance monitor 4 internally for Hinds County, Mr. Synarus Green. 5 THE COURT: What was your last name again, sir? 6 MR. GREEN: Green. 7 THE COURT: Green. I believe we spoke on the phone 8 awhile back, didn't we? 9 MR. GREEN: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: All right. I appreciate you being here, 11 Pursuant to the term of the consent decree, as well as 12 the order of District Judge Barbour, a court monitor was 13 appointed. Ms. Simpson, are you present, ma'am? 14 MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor. And with me I have 15 David Parrish. He is a member of the monitoring team with 16 expertise in correctional operations. 17 **THE COURT:** Okay. How are you, Mr. Parrish? A 18 pleasure to meet you. And Ms. Simpson, are you ready to go 19 forward, ma'am? 20 MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and have a seat for a 22 brief moment. I would ask is Mr. Jimmy Hendrix present in the 23 courtroom? MR. HENDRIX: Yes, Your Honor. 24 25 **THE COURT:** How are you, Mr. Hendrix?

1 MR. HENDRIX: Fine. Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Sir, I will be very brief. I have in 3 front of me an affidavit that you swore to and signed. 4 MR. HENDRIX: Yes, Your Honor. 5 **THE COURT:** Sir, you promise to abide by all of the 6 terms and condition? 7 MR. HENDRIX: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. It's a pleasure to meet you, sir. 9 MR. HENDRIX: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 **THE COURT:** Mr. Hendrix, if I were to spell your name 11 H-E-N-D-R-I-X, would the Court be correct? 12 MR. HENDRIX: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. 14 All right. I would like to initiate with a procedural 15 I'm going to ask the government if it would be 16 willing, very generally -- and the parties can remain seated as 17 long as we promise not to speak over each other. The parties 18 may remain seated during this proceeding. If you can give just 19 a brief procedural posture, we can start with the entry of the 20 consent decree to present. 21 MR. CHENG: Your Honor, after the consent decree was 22 entered, the monitoring team conducted a baseline inspection of 23 the Hinds County Jail. They have since completed a follow-up 24 inspection, which was the first formal compliance visit. I 25 will leave it up to the monitor to provide more details about

what they are finding. At this time, the United States has some concerns about the jurisdiction's compliance with the consent decree. Almost immediately, most of the deadlines inside the consent decree, the time deadlines came and passed, and a number of them have been violated. So we have asked for a status conference face to face, and the county and sheriff's office have been cooperative in that and have been happy to join us in seeking the status conference.

THE COURT: All right, sir. And let me just inform the parties, it is the intent of this Court to conduct what I will call is monitoring of not only the court monitor but of the overall resolution of the instant litigation.

My goal is cooperation, ladies and gentlemen. It is the belief of this Court that one of my directives is to encourage cooperation. I would like to address any potential deficiencies. And, of course, with any deficiency that is addressed by the court monitor, I'm also going to want to discuss what we need to do to resolve it. All right?

Ms. Simpson, ma'am, are you ready to address the Court as well as the parties?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may proceed, ma'am. And I will tell you that that podium has a button, if you want to raise it or lower it. It's to your right.

MS. SIMPSON: This will be fine. Hopefully -- I

assume this is a microphone, because I tend to be soft-spoken, so let me know if you can't hear me.

THE COURT: Well, the court reporter is the important one here. If she raises her hand, then she will let us know.

But I can hear you fine. And if anyone can't, please just raise your hand.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon. As has been mentioned, the consent decree was entered approximately a year ago — actually, almost. We are about one week shy of a year. And the conditions at the time of the findings letter and continuing on to when the consent decree was entered were seriously deficient. This is detailed in the findings, and I won't go into detail here. However, probably the biggest challenge at that time and, as you will hear, continues to be the biggest challenge is an extreme lack of staffing in the facilities.

As a result, at that time the prisoners were, to a large extent, unsupervised, and this resulted in numerous prisoner assaults, riots actually, ready access to contraband, major structural damage and overdetention of defendants. There are numerous other problems that were detailed in the findings letter, but as I said, the biggest challenge was the extreme lack of staffing.

So suffice it to say, there was a long ways to go this past year. We did a baseline visit in October in which me and

my team, and my team is comprised of Mr. Parrish, who I introduced earlier — he is a corrections expert; Jim Moser, who is a juvenile expert, because there are juveniles being tried as adults held at the facility; and Jacqueline Moore, who is a medical mental health expert. We did the baseline visit in October to determine where the jail was at at that time vis—a—vis the consent decree requirements, if any had been — come into compliance or had potentially backslid.

We then did our first monitoring visit in February. That was another three-and-a-half-day tour, at which we review records, we look at the facility, we meet with staff, we talk with prisoners, as well as lower level staff, and again try to gauge compliance vis-a-vis the consent decree requirements. And we have just completed our second monitoring visit, which was the second week of June.

After the February visit, the monitoring report was completed and filed. The monitoring report for the June visit is not yet due but should circulate to counsel next week, actually. In addition, though, to creating monitoring reports, we have been producing priority recommendations. The consent degree has a very, very fine number of requirements based on the requirements — what was needed in the facility. And in order to assist the defendants in zeroing in on some of the most critical issues, we concluded that it would be helpful to produce priority recommendations after each visit. And so

those were produced after the February visit and have already been provided after the June visit.

I do want to say that the Hinds County defendants have been very cooperative in our site visits. They've made themselves available, made the facility available, have produced documents, not necessarily all the documents that we have requested, but in part, there hasn't been a history of generating all of those documents, so that's been a process. But they definitely have been cooperative, and they have sought the technical assistance of the team and appeared to have utilized that assistance in decision-making.

There does appear to be motivation to improve the conditions at the detention facilities. There has been progress in a number of areas, which I'll mention as we go through. However, in a number of very critical areas, there has actually been no real progress, and those are the ones that we want to focus on a little bit more.

I did want to mention a couple of things about how the facilities are set up just because I think it will help understand where some of the issues are. There's actually three separate facilities that are the Hinds County Detention Facility. One is the Jackson Detention Center, which is an older center downtown. It was built in 1972. It's a traditional styled jail in that it is very linear. It doesn't allow for the new concept of direct supervision. It has a

capacity of 196 individuals. It holds all the females on one floor, and then the males who are considered somewhat lower risk are on another floor. And that's, like I said, in the downtown facility. It is also where people come and go if they are going to court, because the court is downtown. So there's a lot of movement in and out there.

One of the other facilities is the Work Center. This is a very new facility. It was built in 2009. It was built as a 400-bed facility, was holding quite a few state inmates who were there at the end of their sentences doing work release — not work release but working out of there. It also holds pretrial and sentence misdemeanants. It is a dormitory-styled facility, and it has generally been well maintained and adequately staffed. It is out at Raymond, which is about 20 miles away from Jackson.

And then lastly is the Raymond Detention Center, and this really has been the focus of much of the work on the consent decree and of the monitoring team. It was built in 1994, and it has a capacity of 594 people. It is also located out at Raymond. It holds primarily pretrial felony defendants. It also holds juveniles being tried as adults.

It was built as a direct supervision facility, which is considered the best practice in correctional facilities, but with the lack of staffing, it has not operated as such.

This — the lack of staffing eventually led to a lack of

control of the facility. There was a riot in 2012 in which a third of the facility was actually damaged and closed. That has been rehabilitated and reopened, but the condition of the facility itself continues to be a major problem. With the lack of staffing, the prisoners cause significant damage, and it is very difficult to keep up with that.

By the time of the Department of Justice findings letter in 2015, there had been at least three major riots, two alleged homicides, numerous assaults on prisoners and staff, and repeated use of tactical teams to restore order to the facility.

So I'm not going to go through all of the consent decree requirements or even the priority recommendations for that matter. I want to focus on some of the real critical areas, and I believe it is probably already apparent that the most critical area is that of staffing. Without adequate staffing, it would be almost impossible for the county to comply with most of the provisions of the consent decree.

The county sheriff's office currently has 251 authorized positions for the detention facility. Fifty of those positions are currently vacant. A staffing analysis was done initially by a National Institute of Corrections expert, and then again internally in April, and then most recently with the assistance of the corrections expert, it was completed again just last month, in June.

All of these studies were pretty consistent in finding that there needs to be 433 authorized positions. This is 182 more than currently authorized and 230 more than current staff. So the facilities are operating with less than half of the needed staff.

And the staffing shortage is most pronounced in the Raymond Detention Center. As I said, that is one of the three facilities. At this time they are operating at about 37 percent of the staffing that they need, so they have about a third of what they need to staff the facility. And so, as an example, the way the facility is designed, there is a control room and then a pod that has several units. And as a direct supervision facility, there should be one correctional officer in each one of those units. And for the most part, there is never a correctional officer in any of those units, except for the juvenile unit at this time.

They have one officer in the control room and one officer acting as a rover that goes amongst all of the units, and even that is sometimes missing. So as you might imagine, the prisoners are often completely unsupervised.

For an example, because of the lack of staffing, no one — no prisoners in the facility other than the juveniles has had recreation, outdoor recreation, in five years because they don't have the staff to do it.

Another very clear example of the impact of lack of

staffing was not long ago, there was a young individual, 17-year-old, so one of the juveniles, that engaged in a fairly serious suicide attempt. When that happens, there is supposed to be one-on-one staff observation of the individual. Because there was not an officer to do that one-on-one observation, the solution was to take the clothes and the blanket of the individual, the 17-year-old, and leave him in that condition for over a week. So he stayed in his cell without clothes, without a blanket, and it was a very cold unit, and said that he could not sleep or eat due to the coldness. So that was as a result of the lack of staffing in order to do the suicide watches that are needed.

In addition, without the appropriate staffing, there is prevalence of contraband that finds its way into the facility. There was a shakedown in June, on June 7, 2017, in two of the facilities, RDC and the Work Center. And among other things, they recovered 43 cell phones, 39 cell phone chargers, 25 shanks, a digital scale, miscellaneous tobacco products, and marijuana, two steak knives, and 38 DVDs and CDs, a huge amount of contraband that is able to come into the facility.

Also, with the lack of staffing, there are frequent breaches of security. The inmates are able to pull the welding off of some of the doors and pull the metal plates off of some of the prior holes that have been patched up. In the entire period between March and the end of May, there were 16 security

breaches that were reported. Those included actual escapes as well as pulling off the metal plates and creating holes in the roof and in the walls. So the lack of staffing is a huge impact on the facility and really keeps them, as I said, from being able to come into compliance with most of the requirements of the consent decree.

I wanted to emphasize that this is addressed very clearly in the consent decree. Paragraph 42 provides that the defendants shall ensure that the jail has sufficient staffing to adequately supervise prisoners, fulfill the terms of this agreement and allow for the safe operation of the jail. The parties recognize that the board allocates to the sheriff lump sum funding on a quarterly basis. The sheriff recognizes that sufficient staffing of the jail should be a priority for utilizing those funds.

So at the time the consent decree was written, the staffing analysis hadn't been completed, so what constituted sufficient staffing was not fully known at that time, but now with the completion of the staffing analysis, we do know that sufficient staffing is 433 authorized positions.

There have been some steps taken in this area. The sheriff has approved the increase of the salaries of detention officers. This should improve recruitment and detention. It's not entirely clear whether that has been implemented, but it has had initial approval.

One of the problems that has existed has been the use of some of the detention positions for nondetention purposes. And one of the aspects of the staffing analysis was to attempt to identify those detention positions that were being essentially funneled out of the jail and detention activities and used elsewhere. Some of these have in fact been identified and have been moved. That has not increased the availability of staff in the detention division. It has just clarified, at least to some extent, what had been coming under the detention budget which actually wasn't being used as detention services.

So again, to clarify, the sheriff has two divisions: The operations division and the detention division. And what was happening is that some of the positions in the budget within the detention division were being used in the operations division.

THE COURT: Under whose authority does that happen?

MS. SIMPSON: That would have been -- had to be permitted by the sheriff.

THE COURT: All right. So if the Court understands, there are funds in the budget that are -- you said there is an operations budget or a division?

MS. SIMPSON: Division.

THE COURT: And a detention division?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If the Court understands, the budget is

set by the board of supervisors?

MS. SIMPSON: I believe the sheriff proposes the budget, and it is approved by the board of supervisors, but I would defer to the attorneys to answer that.

MR. TEEUWISSEN: That is correct.

THE COURT: They are nodding in the affirmative. All right. So that sounds like one issue. I understand staffing. You've emphasized staffing. And then another issue that we need to address is — I'm sure there was a reason that the funds are being pulled from the detention budget, but that is adversely affecting the consent decree?

MS. SIMPSON: That is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. That is something we need to address as well. I'm sorry to interrupt. You may proceed, ma'am.

MS. SIMPSON: That's fine. Also, relating to what's impacting staffing, obviously the budget needs to include the additional positions that the staffing analysis has identified as needed, and as was mentioned, discontinuing the use of detention positions in budget for nondetention purposes.

There also needs to be, probably as an interim measure, the moving of some of the operations personnel over to detention so that they can begin staffing up more quickly.

There needs to be an aggressive hiring strategy. There have been steps approved for the officers within the detention

facility. There needs to be steps that, again, encourage retention for the deputies and some clarity as to when those steps kick in.

As near as I can tell, there appears to be somewhat of a two-step process. There are the authorized positions, and right now there needs to be more authorized positions, but it also appears to be sort of a separate process to make sure that those authorized positions all have funding attached to them. So there needs to be not only the authorized positions but also funding that goes with them.

So those are the issues related to staffing. A couple of other — a number of other issues I wanted to raise. One is the policies and procedures. At the time of the consent degree, there actually were no policies and procedures in place for the jail. That's sort of a remarkable situation to be in. They didn't exist. It is very difficult to have staff trained appropriately on policies and procedures when there are none.

The practices were all over the map. As I said, there are three facilities. The practices did not match within the different facilities, and they were not consistent with the inmate handbook on things that related to inmates, such as grievance procedures and such. And this is an area where some progress has been made.

Initially, there was — the three facilities operated almost independently. One thing that has happened through this

process is that they are more of a system, and there is at least an understanding that things need to be consistent across the system. There have been draft policies and procedures. They were promulgated after the deadline, but they were promulgated this past April. Comments were provided, according to the consent decree, provided from the monitoring team and the DOJ team. At that point, the policies and procedures should have been finalized within 30 days. That 30 days has just recently passed, but there is a long ways to go in developing adequate policies and procedures.

Many of the policies and procedures were very general, somewhat vague, and didn't match either the practice that was going on or the practice that needed to be detailed in terms of being sufficient guidance for the detention officers, so there is really quite a bit of work that needs to be done on the policies and procedures, and that is a fairly important matter for the operation of the jail.

Another extremely important area of deficiency is the decisions with respect to the juveniles being tried as adults. Again, there was a deadline for determining what should be done with those individuals, those juveniles. That deadline was in January. The decision has not yet been made. The juveniles are — the conditions in which they are confined are really not appropriate for juveniles.

Originally, there really wasn't much separation between

adults and juveniles. That actually has been another area of some improvement. There was absolutely no programming at the time of the site visits, the earlier site visits. Now there is one person who does adult basic education, and the juveniles may attend that between one and three times a week. There is also a chaplain that does a fatherhood group, but the juveniles, being juveniles and still potentially in the educational system, are entitled to much more educational programs, as well as therapeutic programming, and it's very important that they receive that programming.

In addition, and this is sort of a general problem as well, but there is very little behavioral health services for juveniles. Like I said, it is a general issue as well. There is no regular involvement of behavioral health with the youth in terms of supporting their mental health, and there is, again, no regular involvement with the staff, which also needs guidance in working with this population. There is no routine mental health screening. There is no routine educational screening.

And again, this was brought home in a recent event. There was a youth who was experiencing sort of a mental health episode. He ran into what is called the cage, which is a cage-like area at the front of the unit, and beat his head against the cage repeatedly and then proceeded to run around the pod. He tried to jump a table, fell head first and

experienced some head trauma. Again, that is the type of individual who should be identified and provided services with behavioral health services.

That — again, the decision to — where to house them permanently was supposed to be made in January. The consent decree requires that the move actually take place, wherever it is, by June of 2018. Given that the decision has not yet been made where to move them to, and some construction will be required, it is likely that that deadline will be missed as well.

I should say they have hired an architectural team, and they are starting to look at some of the alternatives, but they are definitely behind schedule on that one.

As mentioned earlier, one of the problems with the lack of staffing is that it results in a real lack of maintenance and structural damage to the facility. One thing that has been done, because of the lack of the ability to oversee the prisoners, is that they — the staff has welded shut the maintenance doors, the doors to the recreation yards and the storage doors, so they have just been welded shut. However, the prisoners have learned to break those welds and then cover them with a dark paste. This allows them to get into the pipe chase, which allows them to get up on the roof and elsewhere. This is how some of the escapes have happened, but it is also how many of them get out of the facility over to the fence,

pick up contraband and then go back into the facility. So this inability to control that structural part of the building is obviously contributing to the escapes and to the contraband.

There has been numerous examples of lack of maintenance or things that get broken and aren't repaired quickly enough.

During our February site visit, when more time was spent in the actual units, there were two — the showers could not be shut off. One of the toilets had been out of order for seven months. Lights in the holding cells were inoperable. There is no ventilation in the holding cells. The sallyport doors at RDC have not been fully functioning during any of the site visits. In one of the booking cells, Mr. Parrish, the correctional expert, asked that the booking cell door be opened so that he could look into the cell. The officers were unable to get the door open, and the inmate on the inside had to be asked to push open the door from the inside in order for the officers to get the door open. So the condition remains very difficult.

And again, some progress has been made. The Jackson Detention Center has had a real face lift, and RDC has been attempting to clean and repair some of the units on a case by case basis. But it's still almost impossible, without staffing, for them to keep up with all of the malfunctioning that happens, all the damage that happens.

So I wanted to talk a minute about records and releasing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is another major problem in the facility. The consent decree requires that the detention facility be able to keep sufficient records to be able to track who is in the facility, but most importantly, to release people when it is time for them to be released.

In February we did a review of people that were on the list as being in jail for fines and fees and working off those fines and fees. Out of the 25 files reviewed, ten of them had insufficient paperwork to support detention. This included the sentencing that was missing, holds that were missing, bonds that were missing, warrants that were missing, so significant deficiencies. The paperwork itself could not justify the detention of ten out of 25.

Also, in that site visit I looked at 17 files of people who were on the unindicted list. That is a list that the senior judge requests the jail to make of anybody who has been there without indictment 90 days or more. I looked at 17 of those files. Ten of the 17 people that were listed as in custody without indictment were not actually in custody. had previously been released.

In this trip, I looked at 11 files of individuals who came in on a probation violation warrant, and those individuals are supposed to have a probation violation hearing within 21 days or be released. Of the 11 files I looked at, ten of them were lacking documentation showing the lawful basis of detention.

The missing documentation included the holds themselves, holds that appeared to be lifted but the system hadn't been updated, holds that didn't currently exist. In one case the case had been mistakenly entered as a new charge, and of course it wasn't being processed as a new charge because it wasn't actually a new charge, but the individual continued to be incarcerated as a result.

There were warrants that had been withdrawn but the hold hadn't been lifted, and in some there was no explanation for detention at all. And in one case there was actually no file at all.

It appeared that one individual had been held three months too long but had been released. There was another individual who was in for six months with no documentation of anything holding them.

We also looked at some files of people waiting for hospital beds, state hospital beds. Again, there was another inmate whose file could not be located, and yet another inmate who had three volumes of his file, but the first two couldn't be located.

So it continues to be a problem, a severe problem in actually being able to track who is in the facility and why and when their entitlement to release is. RDC does not track the sentences of individuals at RDC, nor does it track individuals who are entitled to release after 21 days. They typically rely

on the inmates to submit a request, either a grievance or a separate inmate request. No doubt in some of these instances, the individuals do not have the wherewithal to know to do that and stay in longer than they should.

It appeared that there were at least five individuals who were held beyond their release time, although it should be said that because of the conditions of the records, it could be they are held in on something else that doesn't appear in the records.

So there is basically a practice of not recognizing that 21 days as a firm deadline. Understandably, the jail prefers a Court order to actually confirm that a release is proper, but their attitude is more that the D.O.C. will eventually get something to them, and they are not proactive about making that happen. So there really needs to be —

THE COURT: The records and filing issues that you are addressing, does that fall under operations?

MS. SIMPSON: No, that would be under the detention facility as well.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry to interrupt.

MS. SIMPSON: No, that is okay. Another issue is reporting and use of reporting. At the time we began our work, there had been only three use of force reports in the prior ten months, although that is really not realistic for a facility of that size. It indicates a lack of reporting. The reporting

has increased since then. It is very difficult to tell if it is complete. We do know in some instances it is not — they are supposed to prepare an incident report if somebody is detained beyond their release date. There were no such incident reports, and we know that there have been overdetention incidents.

It is also unlikely that they have not experienced any lost property during this time frame, and there should be incident reports regarding lost property, and there are no such reports there as well.

They are developing a computer-based incident and use of force report which should assist them in creating the summary reports that are required by the consent decree. Right now they don't have summary reports that are consistent, and those are really necessary to guide really oversight of the facility and the operations in the facility.

One area that is, as all of these really, particularly problematic is the use of confinement and segregation. Again, when we started, there was a practice of using a couple of the cells in the booking area for individuals with severe mental illness. This was really not tolerable, and that has discontinued, so that was a very good step forward. They are using some isolation cells in one of the units for segregation or confinement, and some of those are individuals with severe mental illness that have not succeeded well in general

population. Particularly for those with severe mental illness, it is still not an appropriate setting. The consent decree requires that they have individual and group treatment, as well as treatment and therapeutic housing when it is needed.

The conditions in those isolation cells is that they are pretty much continuously locked down in the cells. There are no services. They are able to watch T.V. by sitting on the floor and looking through the feed slots, and that has kept them somewhat entertained. There are now rounds being conducted on that unit. However, many individuals are locked down throughout the general population of the jail, and there is really not a very good way of identifying where and who is locked down, and those individuals do not get rounds as is required by the consent decree and best practices.

Sort of combined with this is the lack of mental health program generally, as well as any dedicated area for individuals with mental health issues. There is a part-time — well, a contract psychiatrist who comes in for a couple of hours a week and a contract psychologist who comes in for a couple of hours a week, but they don't have the level of mental health staff that is needed. They don't have adequate — they don't have a designated space with specially trained officers, which would be needed in a well—run mental health unit. And unfortunately, as is the case all over the country, that jails have ended up being the mental health providers for many

communities. This is true in Hinds County as well. It is unfortunate, but it is the reality, and it really is necessary to ensure that those people are properly housed and receive treatment.

This is particularly true, I would say, in Hinds County and the state in general where there are only 15 forensic beds in the state hospital, and there have been individuals waiting for those state hospital beds five or six years in the county jail, and those are often the most challenging individuals.

Their medical staffing is low, even with what is supposed to be in the contract. They are now short four nurses, which is a fairly high percentage of the contract, and so they are not able to provide the level of medical services that are needed. And this really requires some more significant oversight of the medical contract.

THE COURT: Is that in addition to the 433 --

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, yes, because the medical services are provided pursuant to a contract with a private company.

One issue that has been briefly mentioned earlier is the problem with fines and fees, people being in the jail ordered to pay fines and fees. Again, when the case started, there was a very high number of people there working off fines and fees. The uniform practice was whenever fines and fees were ordered, they were immediately converted into days of work.

And in addition, the staff looked up old fines and fees

and added that to the number of days. There has been improvement here in that the jail staff is not now automatically converting orders to days and looking up old fines and fees, but unfortunately, they are still receiving some orders from the court that in fact are what's been called "pay or stay orders." And I brought the stack of orders that were holding people in the jail at the time of our site visit. They include language that says that the jail shall keep in jail until payment thereof of the fines and shall keep in jail until such sentence is satisfied. They also will say pay or stay directly, or the fines are to be worked off. And in some instances, there is a check-off box that "must pay or work off before release." So there are probably about 30 or 40 people that are in the jail on these orders.

THE COURT: These are judicial orders? These are

THE COURT: These are judicial orders? These are judgments?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, they are sentences, minimus sentences they are called.

THE COURT: From --

MS. SIMPSON: Mostly --

THE COURT: -- municipal court, a justice court, potentially a circuit court?

MS. SIMPSON: I have not seen any from circuit court, but justice and municipal.

THE COURT: So this is a lower court ordering a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant to remain in custody until a fine or fee is paid in full? MS. SIMPSON: That is correct. **THE COURT:** And then, obviously, you can't earn an income when you are incarcerated, so the detention center allows them the opportunity to work? MS. SIMPSON: That is correct. THE COURT: All right. MS. SIMPSON: And I would say this is one area where the constitutional law is actually quite clear. That's not always the case, but there is a U.S. Supreme Court case, Tate v. Short, 401 U.S. 395, which holds "The Constitution prohibits the state from imposing a fine as a sentence and then automatically converting it into a jail term solely because the defendant is indigent and cannot forthwith pay the fine in full."

THE COURT: All right. So the orders that you have a stack of in front of you appear to violate the Constitution?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MS. SIMPSON: And the consent decree anticipated that and set forth a process that should be followed. It obviously is a little delicate for the jail to be pushing back on court orders, but it does require that the jail return defendants to the court that have this kind of order and requests that the

court do what is legally required to enter a valid order.

THE COURT: You may know, you may not know, maybe someone in the courtroom may be aware of the recent rules of criminal procedure this Court understands, I believe, were recently enacted in the state.

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do we know, do any of those rules potentially address in any way, shape or fashion what is being addressed to the Court right now with regard to the pay or stay provisions?

MR. TEEUWISSEN: Your Honor, I believe they, if not directly, at least indirectly address that, and I believe the new — I don't profess to be a criminal lawyer, Your Honor, but it is my understanding from talking to members of the committee that drafted those rules, chaired by Justice Kitchens of the Mississippi Supreme Court, that those rules were drafted or revised in part to address these very issues.

THE COURT: So I guess as it pertains to Hinds

County, the defense may, I guess, need to pursue maybe

education, training to our municipal court and justice court

judges.

MR. TEEUWISSEN: Yes, Your Honor. We would agree.

We have spoken with Justice Kitchens as chair of that drafting committee and have asked him to, and he has said he will give a day of his time to Hinds County to set up some sort of

continuing education, which would allow us certainly to get the circuit judges, county judges and hopefully the justice court and City of Jackson municipal judges, which is where most of these orders come from, in the same room.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

MS. SIMPSON: If I may, Your Honor, I think it may also be helpful to affirm that it is appropriate for the jail to return to the courts if they receive an order that is not consistent with the law.

THE COURT: So it is incumbent on the jail to identify what we will refer to as an illegal sentence, right?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes.

THE COURT: But then we are going to go back to the staffing issue is going to cause the jail issue, and then the staffing issue we'll address shortly is going to need to be addressed by the board of supervisors with regard to budget. I didn't mean to interrupt you. Thank you, ma'am.

MS. SIMPSON: There are just a couple more issues.

One of the requirements of the consent decree is that the county retain a consultant to assist them in facilitating the development of a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, a CJCC, and that through the CJCC, there would be an opportunity, then, to address some system issues. Many jurisdictions are moving towards having the CJCC. There are quite a few issues that have been addressed through that process, the number of people

and how long they stay unindicted, the issues around fines and fees, issues around delays in hospital beds being available and competency process. Pretrial decision-making, that is a huge area that many jurisdictions address. And typically, that is done by developing a risk assessment instrument. Through that it often becomes clear that very low and moderate risk people are being held in the jail, and this often assists in reducing a jail population to a number that is more manageable.

So given that some of those issues are very much present here, moving forward on a CJCC is an important requirement of the consent decree. The consultant was supposed to be retained 30 days after the consent decree was entered, so that would have been in August of 2016. I know they are now getting close on that contract. I don't believe it has been finalized yet, or if so, it has just been finalized. There has been no initial meeting of a CJCC. So that is something that is overdue and could potentially provide them some relief on the population, which would provide some relief on the staffing.

Classification has been an issue. They do have a classification tool. They have not been using it with misdemeanors, and as a result, misdemeanors have not been housed based on their risk classification. They basically have been housed because they are misdemeanants. They have been presumed to be lower risk, which is not necessarily the case.

At the time of the last site visit, this was brought to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the attention of the staff, and I believe they are now starting to classify misdemeanants as well. In addition, though, to classifying them, they now need criteria for where people go based on that classification and when they get moved between the three facilities. Their classification previously was five days a week during business hours. They have now expanded it to seven days a week, but classification needs to be 24-hour This can potentially be handled by combining classification and records so that they can sort of multi-task and cover the full 24/7. This is required because really there shouldn't be moves in housing without it being cleared through classification, and that has been an issue after hours. classification still needs to be worked on.

The booking areas are both very poor facilities. have got outdated cells, outdated doors. There is no visual ability to see within the cells. There is a lot of traffic, particularly at Jackson Detention Center, going through booking, no detention, overcrowding. The corrections expert has recommended that they move to an open booking style, which would address this unsafe and inhumane setup in the booking area, and that is something that needs to be moved on.

Those are the particular subject areas I wanted to I did, sort of as a general matter, want to mention that deadlines have not generally been adhered to, and that continues to be an ongoing problem.

The staffing study, just to run through a few —— the staffing study was due January 17th. It was done in April and then actually not finished until June. The training requirements have not been met. They are behind on those. The policies and procedures should have been completed in January and were not done until April, and now they are overdue on finalizing it. Self-assessment was due November, 2016. That has not been completed. Technical assistance on the CJCC was due August '16. That hasn't been completed. The housing decision for youth was due January 17th, and that hasn't been completed. There are several more, but as was mentioned previously, most of the deadlines that were in the consent decree have been missed. Some have been completed late, and some are still undone.

THE COURT: Okay, ma'am. Thank you. I don't have any questions at this time. I appreciate the work that you've done in furtherance of ultimate resolution, hopefully. I may have some questions as we proceed. I'm going to give the parties an opportunity to speak, but I will allow you to have a seat. You have been standing for some time.

MS. SIMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I appreciate the work you have done on this.

All right. What says the plaintiff, the government at this time, if anything?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHENG: Your Honor, I would like to provide a little context for some of the violations that Ms. Simpson has identified. The first is the staffing study. Ms. Simpson indicated that they failed to meet the deadline for the staffing study. Under the consent decree, the county had the first crack at providing reasonable staffing figures. generally assumed that the NIC figures that had been done for them some years back would be pretty close on what they required. The county did not, however, complete their own independent staffing study. So under the consent decree, the monitor and her corrections consultant could provide technical assistance. Mr. Parrish basically sat with his counterparts in security at the jail, and they crunched the numbers. So the numbers that are provided are pretty reasonable from the United States' point of view. I should note, however, that to this date, the county still has not formally adopted this as the staffing study.

The other thing I'd also want to provide a little bit of context about is the policies and procedures issue. Policies and procedures are about more than just documentation or formal policy just so people know what is going on. The policy process that's been built into the agreement is designed to allow the jurisdiction to incorporate the consent decree requirements into a unified system of operations. So, for example, from the moment someone is booked until the time they

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are classified based on their security risk until the time they are housed, there are certain things envisioned in the decree that have to be built into the policy process. So by not submitting a policy that incorporates the consent decree, it throws off implementation of other provisions as well.

The third thing I would like to address is the issue of the youth. We do realize that the initial decision on where to place a youth, which looked fairly simple at the beginning -at first we thought the youth could just be placed at Henley-Young, which is a juvenile detention facility in the county. That has turned out to be more complicated than However, even under the decree, we did have some expected. provisions to allow them to make a reassessment and make a decision. They just needed to do what they needed to do to find out what their options are and make its choice, and they still haven't really done that yet. Hiring the architect is helpful, but they are well behind on that process.

The final thing I want to talk about from the monitor's report is the issue of overdetention, the fines and fees. There are a number of these odd criminal justice procedures that have -- there are deficiencies with the criminal justice process in Hinds County that affect the jail. We recognize that we are focused on the constitutional rights of inmates inside the jail, and so the decree has some remedies to try to make that process work better. But at some point, the county

has to take some responsibility for fixing its own system. So we required that they create a Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee and at least get a dialogue among key players within the county on how to address these broader community and system issues that were causing so many constitutional violations in the jail.

It is frankly incredible to us that there are people who are held in a jail who, for all practical purposes, there is no documentation explaining why they are still in the jail. It is unconscionable. And there are a number of reasons why that process is happening this way that have to be addressed at the Criminal Justice Committee level. To not even convene the committee and at least start cracking on it is a real problem there. Hiring a consultant will help, but again, it is just a consultant that helps them set up the process. The county has to take some ownership of it. Until then, they are just ignoring really clear requirements in the consent decree.

I think that is it for now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. If I could ask, I will ask the defense, but I suspect Sheriff Mason will be able to answer. How much does it cost to house an inmate on a daily basis?

MR. TEEUWISSEN: Nobody knows.

THE COURT: Nobody knows.

SHERIFF MASON: Per inmate?

THE COURT: Per inmate, just a ballpark.

MR. TEEUWISSEN: Your Honor, before anybody gives an off-the-cuff answer, there has been no analysis done.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I thank the counsel for the plaintiff for those comments. What says the board of supervisors, if anything?

MR. TEEUWISSEN: Your Honor, may I briefly -- may I sit?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. TEEUWISSEN: I'll briefly address three things:
The 433 number, the juveniles, and the Criminal Justice
Coordinating Committee.

The 433 number was provided for the first time on June 30th of this year, so this is not a number that the county has had for some extended period of time. It has had it about ten days with the intervening 4th of July holiday. It has not had an opportunity to discuss this with Mr. Parrish in some detail as to the underlying assumptions in that number. So I don't want Your Honor to think that the board has failed to budget for something that it has just been provided.

In contrast, the sheriff's office complete personnel is currently 430. That would be detention and everything else, every secretary, everybody. So, clearly, this 433 number, which is significantly different than the National Institute of Corrections number that everyone had operated on, is something

that the board of supervisors will look into going forward, but we are going to need some time on behalf of the board to really look into that number and understand the assumptions and what number is appropriate.

With respect to the juveniles, as Mr. Cheng said, everyone assumed that was going to be an easy piece. The county has a facility, the Henley-Young facility, in which it currently houses juveniles who are not charged with felonies. The assumption was going to be that perhaps we could move those individuals there. That facility is also under a consent decree. And, quite frankly, the monitor, Jim Moser, in this case, the monitor in the Henley-Young case, Leonard Dixon, as well as other individuals, have not been able to reach a consensus. It's not that the county has not been trying to figure out what to do with the juveniles. The experts can't agree. I'm not sure how a board is supposed to solve something if the experts can't agree.

Having said that, the board recently engaged an architect who has designed specifically juvenile facilities, and that architect will present this week some preliminary drawings and ideas on how to renovate existing county facilities or do a new stand-alone to house those juveniles.

That population runs about 20 on any given day. The sad thing, Your Honor, the Henley-Young facility has an 84-bed capacity, and we run about 15 juveniles charged with

nonfelonies on any given day. So we have got beds at that facility, but again, that is a facility, although it was built in the 1990s, that isn't necessarily designed for juveniles charged with felons. The programming is there, Your Honor, so we are looking at that.

On the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee, we have got the media here, and I want to be careful what I say, but let me make this abundantly clear. The Hinds County Board of Supervisors has no control over the district attorney. The district attorney has been invited, before the Department of Justice ever showed up, to quarterly meetings that occurred between the circuit judges, the public defender, the sheriff's office to help solve these problems. The district attorney remains engaged in other priorities, and I will leave it at that.

We will — we have retained the criminal justice consultant. We will start those meetings. But as a practical matter, we do not see any short solutions coming forward until we can figure out how to get the district attorney's office better engaged. And that is a problem, Your Honor, that the Mississippi Supreme Court has spoken to. In fact, there is an opinion by Justice Carlson, now retired, about five years ago, in which he expressed for the Supreme Court frustration with the Hinds County District Attorney's Office.

I will answer any questions you have, Your Honor, but

those are the three areas that I wanted to respond to on behalf of the board.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. And I appreciate your comments. What says, if anything, the sheriff's department, Ms. Barker?

MS. BARKER: I would like to echo Mr. Teeuwissen comments. However, I would like to address one issue with the policies and procedures. It is true that the jail did not have any policies and procedures whenever this consent decree was entered. We submitted and approved policies and procedures for all three facilities in April. That was then submitted to the Department of Justice and also the monitors, who had very lengthy comments on those policies and procedures.

A visit was had by all monitors, the Department of Justice, June 6th. We then received a good manual to go by that Mr. Parrish submitted to us on June 6th, so we are looking into perhaps hiring someone on the — a third party to come in and help revise those policies and procedures.

So I just would like to let the Court know that we have received this in short time, and we are currently addressing that.

THE COURT: All right, ma'am. Thank you for your comments.

MS. BARKER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further on behalf of any of the

parties at this time? Ultimately, before we recess, I'm going to want to address future scheduling of telephone conferences and status conferences, but prior to that, any further comments, additional comments at this time?

MR. CHENG: Your Honor, I appreciate this one more thing.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. CHENG: Ms. Simpson mentioned a self-assessment process, and one of the things we do in these consent decrees is we create a road map to deal with what's at the facility but also to deal with these types of contingencies. So, for example, if there is a delay in making the decision about juveniles, or if there is a problem with the staffing analysis, but it is important that the county have a self-assessment process. And Ms. Simpson has actually gone to the county to sort of explain to them how that process can be set up so they collect information on their own, they identify deadlines, and they can adapt as there are problems.

The idea of a self-assessment is to identify the provisions of the decree, if they are in compliance, and if they are not in compliance, what they are going to do in the near future to try to bring themselves into compliance.

So as a problem-solving tool, it is very useful to have something like that in place. It is required by the decree, but so far, for example, the county does not actually have a

system like that in operation. So as you are considering what to advise Judge Barbour of what to do, that is something to think about as well.

THE COURT: Any comments with regard to that on behalf of the defense?

MR. TEEUWISSEN: No, Your Honor. I did have one other comment on a different area.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. TEEUWISSEN: Your Honor, Hinds County currently has approximately a \$3.2 million structural budget deficit.

The county has been relatively well managed, has until last month — has had the same bond rating as the state of Mississippi. However, they have pulled reserves to make repairs to the jails, and they are going to have to deal with their structural budget deficit.

I say all of that as foundation that if the board fixed the budget and said, we will go from 250 detention officers to 300, if we got with Mr. Parrish and said, would that be a step in the right direction, the county has no assurance that if it budgets and provides funding, that that funding will actually be spent by the sheriff on detention, and that is going to continue to be an issue or cause of concern between the board and the sheriff's office.

THE COURT: This -- and I was going to address that.

We touched on that briefly, initially, during the status update

provided by Ms. Simpson. You know, ladies and gentlemen, to the actual parties in the courtroom, it should be the intention of all parties to comply with the terms and conditions of the consent decree. I would hope that the sheriff's department and the board of supervisors would be working conjunctively towards complying with the terms and conditions.

I can speak to and I will allow the attorneys to add to it. If we follow logically looking into the future, what will happen if the terms and conditions are not being met and not being complied with? I understand there has been some progress made, but there have also been some areas of some deficiencies. I'm confident that your legal counsel has addressed this with you, but, you know, the goal should be compliance and to preclude the necessity of a motion. All right?

If the terms and the conditions are not being met, there may be a motion filed by the plaintiff to enforce the terms and conditions of the consent decree. Now, what may be included with that or what may potentially happen is a judicial determination that someone in the courtroom, one of the parties, is not in compliance, and there is the potential that you could be found in contempt. All right?

I'm hoping that the actual parties -- I'm glad you are present today for the hearing. I don't see how that would be in anyone's best interest to be found in contempt, a judicial determination that you are found in contempt of the consent

1 decree.

In addition to a finding of contempt, there may be sanctions imposed. So what this Court is encouraging is coordination between the board of supervisors and the sheriff's department, is all I can say at this point. It just makes sense. Each of you, it's incumbent on each of you to comply with the terms and conditions.

Now, I understand there may be some difficulties, and your attorneys have mentioned that there are some road blocks, maybe some hindrances to complete compliance, but ultimately, that is what is going to be required is compliance with the consent decree that was signed by a United States Court District Judge.

All right. To the Court's knowledge, there has not been a motion to enforce that's been filed, but I will ask plaintiff's counsel at this time, is that something you would foresee?

MS. COWALL: Your Honor, I can answer if you would like. Speaking on behalf of the civil rights division, yes, as of January of this year, the department could have brought a contempt motion for the missed deadlines and the consent judgment. However, we are here today, and we are looking to the sheriff, we are looking to the board of commissioners, to demonstrate to us that they have a plan that they will be able to implement to timely get into compliance with the consent judgment.

The monitoring team has laid out a number of priority

MR. MCQUIRTER: And we are working together, our

25

counsels are working together, our counterparts having to meet as well to address as many of these as we can. Some of them, again, we have been working on them. We just have not been able to get all of them resolved in these time frames that have been placed before us.

THE COURT: I understand, and I appreciate that, sir.

Let me ask, just to be certain so the Court understands,

Sheriff Mason, sir, do you understand what transpired when we are discussing the potential of the plaintiff filing a motion?

SHERIFF MASON: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And again, as I initiated, the goal is for cooperation, and this Court's goal, in my opinion, is initially to try to get us to work together towards resolution and hopefully not being put in a position of having to have a formal motion to enforce. It's in no one's interest to be placed in that position.

All right. Let me ask Ms. Simpson, ma'am, what is the next event to take place?

MS. SIMPSON: The next event will be our monitoring report from the June monitoring visit. It will be circulated to counsel and then should be finalized within 30 days of that circulation.

THE COURT: Okay. So that should be around August; is that correct, ma'am?

MS. SIMPSON: That is correct.

THE COURT: All right. What says the parties to a status conference, a telephonic status conference in the month of September? What says the plaintiff?

MR. CHENG: We agree that would be very sensible, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the board of supervisors?

MR. TEEUWISSEN: We agree, Your Honor. Under state law, the board must adopt a budget for fiscal year '18. That begins October 1 of 2017. And so we think a status conference in September will be helpful because we will be able to present to the Department of Justice and the Court a proposed — or adopted, it should be adopted by that point — budget that will incorporate many of these recommendations.

THE COURT: Okay. And what says the sheriff's department?

MS. BARKER: We do agree with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So we will set a telephonic status conference that will be noticed by the Court. And what says — well, let me initiate by asking the court monitor, Ms. Simpson, do you see a need for a follow-up in-person status conference?

MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor, I think that would be very helpful. We have our October site visit the third week of October, and it might be helpful to have an in-person status conference following that site visit.

since they're out of state, the opportunity to come to the

coast and make easier travel arrangements.

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Teri B. Norton, RMR, FCRR, RDR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

S/ Teri B. Norton

TERI B. NORTON, RMR, FCRR, RDR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER